



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,992	06/16/2006	Kikuo Yamada	HOS-73	4522
7590 H. Jay Spiegel & Associates PC P.O. Box 11 Mount Vernon, VA 22121			EXAMINER MCDONALD, SHANTESE L	
			ART UNIT 3723	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/577,992

Applicant(s)

YAMADA, KIKUO

Examiner

Shantese L. McDonald

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5,9-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (6,968,591), in view of Tanaka (6,506,472).

Tanaka (6,968,591) teaches a cleaning tool sheet comprising fiber bundles, 3,4,6, laminated on one side of a base sheet, 5, wherein the base sheet and the fiber bundles have thermal fusibility, wherein central parts in the direction of flow of the fiber constituting the fiber bundles are joined by a central joining part, 7, continuously formed in the central part of the base sheet and joined at a joining part formed on a parallel line between the central joining part and two end edges parallel there with, wherein the two ends in the direction of flow of the fibers are not joined to the base sheet, (col. 5, line 64-c01.6, line 6). Tanaka (6,968,591) also teaches a holding sheet comprising two non-woven sheets bounded together to define a holding part therein, the holding sheet

bonded to a side of the base sheet opposite the fiber bundles, (col. 9, lines 36-50), the holding sheet comprising two bag form holding parts, 22, (col. 8, lines 26-37), the holding sheets further comprising a color part indicating a location for insertion of an insertion part of a cleaning tool and further comprising a pattern of surface irregularities, 24, indicating a location of insertion of a cleaning tool, (col. 9, lines 40-44). Tanaka (6,968,591) teaches all the limitations of the claims except for joining part formed intermittently on a parallel line between the central joining part and the two edges being intermittent spot-form joining portions formed such that they don't overlap in the direction of flow of the fiber bundles, the thickness of the fibers being 1 to 18 denier, and the holding sheet comprising a single non-woven sheet folded in two and heat sealed to a side of a base sheet opposite the fiber bundles. Tanaka et al. (6,506,472) teaches for joining part formed intermittently on a parallel line between the central joining part and the two edges being intermittent spot-form joining portions formed such that they don't overlap in the direction of flow of the fiber bundles, (col. 6, line 64-col. 7, line 7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the tool of Tanaka (6,968,591), with for joining part formed intermittently on a parallel line between the central joining part and the two edges being intermittent spot-form joining portions formed such that they don't overlap in the direction of flow of the fiber bundles, as taught by Tanaka et al. (6,506,472), in order to enhance durability of the cleaning tool. It would have been further obvious to provide the tool of Tanaka (6,968,591) with the fiber bundles having a thickness of the fibers being 1 to 18 denier, as a matter of obvious design choice. It would have been further

obvious to provide the tool of Tanaka (6,968,591), with the holding sheet comprising a single non-woven sheet folded in two and heat sealed to a side of a base sheet opposite the fiber bundles, since Tanaka teaches fusing two sheets to form a holding part, and it is obvious to provide two sheets, or fold on sheet in half to form a holding part.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/21/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that there is not motivation to combine the Tanaka (6,968,591) and the Tanaka (6,506,472) references. The Examiner disagrees. Both Tanaka references teach cleaning tool comprising fiber bundles. The Applicant argues that Tanaka (6,506,472) does not teach spot-form joining parts formed intermittently along a direction crossing the flow direction of the fibers. The Examiner also disagrees. The Applicant notes that figure 2 of the present invention to illustrate a spot-form joining. The figure shows circle-like spots. The Examiner feels that the lines, 5, of Tanaka (6,506,472), can be considered to be spot-form joined since Tanaka (6,506,472) teaches that the fibers are bonded on the line, 5. The lines, 5 are bonded in a direction crossing the flow of the fibers as shown in figure 2. The "spot" of the present invention has not been defined as a certain shape or structure, and therefore the lines, 5, of Tanaka (6,506,472) can be considered to be a "spot".

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantese L. McDonald whose telephone number is (571) 272-4486. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

S.L.M.
June 9, 2008

/Joseph J. Hail, III/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3723